REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson et al. (hereinafter Robinson), " A framework for interacting with paper", Eurographics. 1997, Volume 16, Number 3 [www.cl.cam.ac.uk.Research/orignami1997c/index.html], pages 1-9.

The amendment of claims 1-2 and 9 is for clarification purposes and is not in response to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness-type double patenting rejections with the following arguments.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson et al. (hereinafter Robinson), " A framework for interacting with paper", Eurographics. 1997, Volume 16, Number 3 [www.cl.cam.ac.uk.Research/orignami1997c/index.html], pages 1-9.

Since claim 8 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 8 under obviousness-type double patenting is moot.

Applicants respectively contend that claim 1 of the present patent application is not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson, because claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1 of the present patent application.

For example, claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson do not teach or suggest the following feature of claim 1 of the present patent application:

"storing in said hyperlink table an identification of the **first physical document**;

storing in said hyperlink table an identification of a page of the **first physical document** and an identification of a hyperlinked item defined on said page;

associating with the hyperlinked item a point on a page of a **second physical document**;

storing in said hyperlink table absolute coordinates of the **associated point**" (emphasis added).

Whereas the preceding feature of claim 1 of the present patent application recites aspects of two physical documents, namely a first physical document and a second physical document, claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson recite aspects of only one physical document. Claim 1 of the present invention is directed to creating hyperlinks from hyperlinked items referenced in the first physical document to particular points on the second physical document, which is not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson.

Based on the preceding argument, Applicants respectively contend that claim 1 of the present patent application is not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson. Since claims 2-7 of the present patent application depend from claim 1 of the present patent application, Applicants respectively contend that claims 2-7 of the present patent application are likewise not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson.

Applicants respectively contend that claim 9 of the present patent application is not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson, because claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson do not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 9 of the present patent application.

For example, claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson do not teach or suggest the following feature of claim 9 of the present patent application:

"a **first opto-touch foil** aligned with a page of a **first physical document**;

a user system;

a connection between said first opto-touch-foil and said user system;

a **second opto-touch foil** aligned with a **second physical document**; and

a connection between said second opto-touch-foil and said user system" (emphasis added).

Whereas the preceding feature of claim 9 of the present patent application recites aspects of two physical documents, namely a first physical document and a second physical document, claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson recite aspects of only a one physical document.

In addition, the preceding feature of claim 9 of the present patent application recites aspects of two opto-touch foils, namely a first opto-touch foil associated with the first physical document and a second opto-touch foil associated with the second physical document. In contrast, claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson recite aspects of only a one opto-touch foil associated with only one physical document.

Based on the preceding argument, Applicants respectively contend that claim 9 of the present patent application is not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson.

The preceding analysis established that claims 1-7 and 9 of the present patent application are not obvious over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,283 in view of Robinson.

Accordingly, Applicants respectively contend that obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-7 and 9 of the present patent application is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 08/12/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850